

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES (DHCS)
CHILDREN'S MEDICAL SERVICES BRANCH (CMS)
CALIFORNIA NEWBORN HEARING SCREENING PROGRAM (NHSP)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) #07-65553**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. **If California DHCS prefers to have the vendor provide hosting of the application, can it be physically hosted outside of the State?**

Yes, it may be physically hosted outside the State.

2. **If California DHCS prefers to have the vendor provide hosting of the application, is the funding for that service included in or subject to the funding limits listed in the RFP?**

Yes, hosting is included in and subject to the funding limits listed in the RFP.

3. **RFP Body - Notice to Prospective Proposers. If a vendor were to submit a fully compliant response to the RFP that included a pricing that exceeded the funding limits as stated in Item IV (Funding Limit) in the Notice to Prospective Proposers, would that submission be disqualified as unresponsive?**

Yes, the proposal would be disqualified as non-responsive. Page 38, I., i., 4), c) of the Cost Section specifies that the cost of services may not exceed \$500,000 for the first year and \$500,000 in any one subsequent fiscal year or budget period. The Total Cost of the service may not exceed \$2,500,000 over the potential five-year life of the service contract.

4. **RFP Body, Page 15, I., 3., e., Service Requirements Section, Response Codes table. The definition for the Service Requirement Response Code N, New Feature, seems to imply that when used the responder is indicating that the requirement is not intended to be met as there is no degree of customization effort indicated as with Response Codes M and C. Is this a correct interpretation?**

The definition of "N" will be replaced by "will not provide". An addendum will be released to capture this change. Please see Page 38, Section I.,3.,i.,5.),a.),i – Activity 1 – One-Time Service Preparation Fee, of the RFP. Bidders must include the cost of all customizations required to meet the mandatory requirements, and the proposed cost must also be within the specified budget. For all non-mandatory requirements, bidders may decide what customizations they can offer within the State's budget. **Bidders are admonished to not mark any mandatory requirement ("must" or "shall") with an "N" as this will cause their proposal to be rejected as nonresponsive.**

5. **RFP Body, Page 16, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III – Service Requirements.** There appears to be no requirements to capture data as it relates specifically to hearing tests as recorded on the California Newborn Hearing Screening Program Diagnostic Audiologic Evaluation Reporting Form. Is that correct? Is it safe to assume that the only requirements for data capture are detailed in Exhibit A – Attachment III?

The system must be able to capture the data on the referenced form. An addendum will be released to capture this change.

6. **RFP Body, Page 16, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III - Service Requirements, Requirement #4.** This requirement states that two contacts must be available for follow up. Can the State elaborate on what this means? Additionally, does the state want the ability to enter any number of contacts such as a one to many relationship between the infant and the contact, or is a finite number, two or three for example, sufficient?

The State desires as flexible a system as possible. Bidders should describe how the proposed system meets or exceeds the requirement.

7. **RFP Body, Page 16, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III – Service Requirements, Requirement #5.** Can the State elaborate on what is desired within this Requirement?

The State desires as flexible a system as possible. Bidders should describe how the proposed system meets or exceeds the requirement.

8. **RFP Body, Page 19.** Does California DHCS intend to use their own Information Technology (IT) resources to host the application? If so, please provide some details around this arrangement to enable the vendor to understand the California resources, location(s) and circumstances for which we would need to plan.

The State is seeking a service and does not plan to use any IT resources.

9. **RFP Body, Page 19, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III - Service Requirements, Requirement #30.** This requirement references a “flexible event creation”. Can the State elaborate on this? Is an “event creation” basically an interaction between the proposed Newborn Hearing Screening program and other already existing programs and agencies? Or is this phrase used to describe sub-events associated with the Infant Record?

If the former, is the State asking for interfaces with applications? If so, exactly how many applications are there (to interface with) and what is the nature of the exchange, or export that needs to take place with each of them?

The state desires a flexible means by which to alert caseworkers of “events” that may require action on their part. “Event creation” would be the mechanism by which an authorized user could introduce such an “event” to the system.

- 10. RFP Body, Page 20, I., 3., e., Exhibit A – Attachment III – Services Requirements, Requirement #41. What information specifically would need to be captured from “medical records systems” under this requirement?**

Different hospital systems/medical records systems report demographic information and/or the results of hearing screening tests in different ways. The State desires a system to capture these results in a flexible automated fashion.

- 11. RFP Body, Page 20, I., 3., e., Exhibit A – Attachment III – Services Requirements, Requirement #41. What information specifically would need to be captured from “hearing screening equipment” under this requirement?**

Different “hearing screen equipment” report the results of hearing screening tests in different ways. The State desires a system to capture these results in a flexible automated fashion.

- 12. RFP Body, Page 20 and 22, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III- Service Requirements, Requirement # 41 and 76. These Requirements both reference equipment. What is the number of devices the State intends to have interface with the system? Can the State provide the make, model and manufacturer of each of these pieces of equipment?**

The number of devices and make/models of pieces of equipment cannot be detailed in this document.

- 13. RFP Body, Page 20, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III – Service Requirements, Requirement #42. Can the State elaborate on what is desired within this Requirement? Also, how many different formats are there?**

The State desires as flexible a system as possible. Bidders should describe how the proposed system meets or exceeds the requirement.

- 14. RFP Body, Page 20, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III – Service Requirements, Requirement #44. This Requirement requests the proposer “state their commitment to meet future reporting requirements” of various programs (federal agencies). Is it the State’s intention to have the proposer price the work for these yet to be developed reporting requirements or simply to make the commitment**

to meet them at a future date through a mutually agreed upon change order process?

The State desires the successful bidder to maintain the proposed system to meet future reporting requirements of various federal agencies as part of the delivered services. Bidders should describe how the proposed system meets or exceeds the requirement.

- 15. RFP Body, Page 21, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III – Service Requirements, Requirement #65. This requirement states that “User queries must respect the regional organization.” Can the State elaborate on what is meant by this?**

The “regional organization” refers to the HCCs and their associated hospitals.

- 16. RFP Body, Page 22 and 23, I., 3., e., Exhibit A-Attachment III – Service Requirements, Requirement #78 and 79. These requirements seem to imply that an entity other than the State will store the data/records. Will the State entertain the option of having these records stored and maintained by the State itself?**

No, the State is not entertaining the option of storing and maintaining the records itself.

- 17. RFP Body, Page 25, I., 3., f., Service Delivery Schedule. How many different stakeholder *groups* does the State anticipate needing to be trained in the new system? How many individuals are anticipated within each of these groups? Can the State detail the different geographical regions referenced?**

The State has identified three stakeholder groups for training purposes, State, HCC, and Hospital staff. Please see Section A., 2., Background, of the RFP for a description of the number of HCCs and Hospitals. Each HCC represents a geographic region of California and each hospital is associated with one HCC. Bidders are expected to propose their best solution for training.

- 18. RFP Body, Page 36, I., 3., i., Cost Section. Please confirm if we are to submit a separate narrative response and cost response as there is no reference in the RFP body, however it seems separate copies for each are referred to in Attachment 2?**

The cost proposal does not need to be separated from the rest of the proposal other than as requested in Section 3. - Content Requirements and specifically in Section 3., i. – Cost Section of the RFP.

- 19. RFP Body, Page 37, I., 1), e). This subsection states that the Annual Fee for providing the Data Management Service will be made quarterly,**

in arrears. It is difficult for small businesses to accommodate such an infrequent payment schedule. Will the State consider making these payments monthly? Or at work case bi-monthly.

Yes, with justification the State will consider a payment schedule more frequent than quarterly.

- 20. RFP Body, Page 51, L., 2., Agency Capability, #2. This rating factor states that the qualifying company must have 2 years of experience in delivering a Hearing Screening Data Management System (data management services). My company has provided large data management services for State and private customers, however, it was not specifically for hearing screening application. Would this disqualify us from bidding?**

No, your company would not be disqualified from bidding.

- 21. RFP Body, Page 59, L., 3. Table 6 - Service Requirements Rating Factor, Rating Factor #33. The RFP asks if the proposed system provides for “recording events”. Can the State elaborate on this desired functionality? The language of “including, but not limited to” is found here. Can the State detail exactly how many events, screens or applications are involved?**

Additionally, can the State detail what type of data is collected for an Inpatient Screen versus a CHDP referral and whether these would require two different screens or just one screen with an indicator of the type of service this would be?

See answer to question #9. Bidders should describe what events the proposed system would accommodate.

- 22. Attachment 13 – Cost Proposal Form, Page 1., Dates of Deliverables and Payment Schedules. The timeline provided may not match the Service Delivery Schedule that is developed for the RFP. Can the date range be changed by the proposer to reflect the date ranges that are determined by the Service Delivery Schedule developed for the RFP response? It would be our desire to match the payment ranges with the proposed Service Delivery Schedule if there are any differences.**

Yes, bidders should reflect the projected dates of the deliverables in the cost sections with the understanding that the budget constraints remain fixed to specific fiscal years.

- 23. Exhibit E, page 6, 13, Additional Provisions, Liquidated Damages. This subsection does not define “Failure Hour,” “Failure Day” Failure Month other than to say, these are periods for which DHCS may withhold funds. Clarification is needed.**

Please see Exhibit A, Attachment II for specific instance definitions of the referenced terms.

- 24. The website for the NHSP includes useful information regarding the program but we note that the website has undergone changes in recent weeks. What is the current website for the NHSP?**

The current NHSP website is www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/nhsp.